



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/585,465	12/18/2006	Masami Yamamoto	SCET 22.664 (100809-00339)	5899
26304 7590 08/03/2010 KATTEN MUCHIN ROSENMAN LLP 575 MADISON AVENUE NEW YORK, NY 10022-2585			EXAMINER BOLOTIN, DMITRIY	
			ART UNIT 2629	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 08/03/2010	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/585,465	Applicant(s) YAMAMOTO ET AL.	
	Examiner Dmitriy Bolotin	Art Unit 2629	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 April 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

It would be of great assistance to the Office if all incoming papers pertaining to a filed application carried the following items:

1. Application number (checked for accuracy, including series code and serial no.).
2. Group art unit number (copied from most recent Office communication).
3. Filing date.
4. Name of the examiner who prepared the most recent Office action.
5. Title of invention.
6. Confirmation number (See MPEP § 503).

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 03/23/2010 has been entered.

Status of Claims

2. **Claims 1, 3 – 9, 11, 13 and 14** have been amended, **claims 1 - 14** are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

Art Unit: 2629

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. **Claims 1 – 14** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

As to **claims 1 and 3 – 5**, the specification as originally filed does not provide support for the recitation of the claim “***executing predetermined processing only when the detecting means detects that the virtual touches have been made***”. The specification as first filed has failed to teach one of ordinary skill in the art how to make or use applicant’s claimed invention “***executing predetermined processing only when the detecting means detects that the virtual touches have been made***”.

As to **claim 6**, the specification as originally filed does not provide support for the recitation of the claim “***predetermined function is executed only when production of the image that prompts the input, and the detection that the corresponding area includes the predetermined image, are performed a predetermined number of times***”. The specification as first filed has failed to teach one of ordinary skill in the art how to make or use applicant’s claimed invention “***predetermined function is executed only when production of the image that prompts the input, and the detection that the corresponding area includes the predetermined image, are performed a predetermined number of times***”.

As to **claims 7 and 8**, the specification as originally filed does not provide support for the recitation of the claim “***accepting the virtual touches as predetermined input only when the predetermined number of touch points are touched in the predetermined order by the virtual touches***”. The specification as first filed has failed to teach one of ordinary skill in the art how to make or use applicant’s claimed invention “***accepting the virtual touches as predetermined input only when the predetermined number of touch points are touched in the predetermined order by the virtual touches***”.

As to **claim 9**, the specification as originally filed does not provide support for the recitation of the claim “***object displaying means for displaying, only when the detecting means detects the virtual touches***”. The specification as first filed has failed to teach one of ordinary skill in the art how to make or use applicant’s claimed invention “***object displaying means for displaying, only when the detecting means detects the virtual touches***”.

As to **claim 13**, the specification as originally filed does not provide support for the recitation of the claim “***object displaying means for displaying, only when the detecting means detects the virtual touches***”. The specification as first filed has failed to teach one of ordinary skill in the art how to make or use applicant’s claimed invention “***object displaying means for displaying, only when the detecting means detects the virtual touches***”.

As to **claim 14**, the specification as originally filed does not provide support for the recitation of the claim “***displaying, by the computer image processing part, only***”.

Art Unit: 2629

when the detecting means detects the virtual touches". The specification as first filed has failed to teach one of ordinary skill in the art how to make or use applicant's claimed invention "***displaying, by the computer image processing part, only when the detecting means detects the virtual touches***".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. **Claims 1, 3, 6 – 8** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ohba (US 2002/0097247).

As to **claim 1**, Ohba discloses an information processing system, comprising:

means for producing a computer image (image processor 2 of fig. 2, [0068]) that prompts a player to virtually touch a predetermined plurality of touch points in a predetermined order (a menu comprising layers of pull down menus shown in fig. 7, [0070], for example, in order to select process 24 a user has to touch in following order: MENU -> SELECT2 -> PROCESS24);

means for accepting input of a video image of the player (image input device 101 of fig. 3) picked up by image pickup means (video camera 1 of fig. 1); display control means for superimposing the video image and the computer image on one another and causing a display device to display a superimposed image (superimposing image generator 106 of fig. 3); means for analyzing the video image during display of the computer image (difference value detector 107 of fig. 3) and detecting a virtual touch to any of the plurality of touch points (object controller 105 determines touch [0075]); and

means for executing predetermined processing (CPU 10 of fig. 2, [0070]) when the detecting means detects that the virtual touches have been made to the predetermined number of touch points in the predetermined order (when appropriate process is selected from a pull-down menu, [0070]).

As to **claim 3** (dependent on 1), Ohba discloses the information processing system wherein:

the image producing means sequentially produces predetermined computer images (menu items shown in fig. 7, [0070]) including navigation information indicating a predetermined one touch point to be touched next (such as one SELECT point or PROCESS point of fig. 7, for example, in order to select process 24 a user has to touch in following order: MENU -> SELECT2 -> PROCESS24); and

the means for executing predetermined processing executes the predetermined processing (CPU 10 executes determined process, [0071]) when the detecting means

Art Unit: 2629

detects that the virtual touches have been made for the respective predetermined computer images including the predetermined navigation information that is sequentially produced [0070 – 0071].

As to **claim 6**, Ohba discloses an entertainment system, comprising:

means for producing a computer image including an image for specifying a plurality of areas (image processor 2 of fig. 2);

means for accepting input of a video image (image input device 101 of fig. 3) picked up by image pickup means (camera 1 of fig. 1);

display control means for superimposing the video image and the computer image on one another and causing a display device to display a superimposed image (superimposing image generator 106 of fig. 3); and

means for analyzing the video image by referring to the computer image (difference value detector 107 of fig. 3), wherein:

the image producing means selects one area of the plurality of areas in a predetermined order (menu area of fig. 7), and in the predetermined sequence sequentially produces a plurality of images (SELECT1, SELECT2 and SELECT3 of fig. 7) each of which prompts the input [0070] in a predetermined manner (for example, in order to select process 24 a user has to touch in following order: MENU -> SELECT2 ->

Art Unit: 2629

PROCESS24) and is obtained by displaying the selected area in a manner visually different from others (one of the SELECT images is highlighted when selected, [0070]);

the analyzing means analyzes the video image when each of the plurality of images, that prompts the input in a predetermined manner, is displayed, and detects that an area of the video image, corresponding to the pre-selected area displayed in the manner visually different from others, includes a predetermined image (the object controller determines the color of menu image according to the difference value, [0070 – 0071 and 0075 – 0076]); and

a predetermined function is executed when production of the image that prompts the input, and the detection that the corresponding area includes the predetermined image, are performed a predetermined number of times (as shown in fig. 7, the user has to go through nested menu by pressing at least three touch point in order for a process to execute, [0070 – 0071]).

As to **claim 7**, Ohba discloses an information processing system input accepting method, comprising:

producing a computer image that prompts a player to virtually touch a predetermined plurality of touch points (producing nested menu shown in fig. 7) in a predetermined order (for example, in order to select process 24 a user has to touch in following order: MENU -> SELECT2 -> PROCESS24);

accepting input of a video image of the player (using image input device 101 of fig. 3) picked up by image pickup means (camera 1 of fig. 1);

analyzing the video image (using difference value detector 107 of fig. 3) while superimposing the video image and the computer image on one another (using superimposing image generator 106 of fig. 3) and causing a display device to display a superimposed image (using display controller 108 of fig. 3), and sequentially detecting virtual touches to any of the plurality of touch points (sequentially touching nested menu shown in fig. 7, [0070]); and

accepting the virtual touches as predetermined input when the predetermined number of touch points are touched in the predetermined order by the virtual touches (as shown in fig. 7, the user has to go through nested menu by pressing at least three touch point in order for a process to execute, [0070 – 0071]).

As to **claim 8**, Ohba discloses a recording medium (28 of fig. 2) on which a computer program for accepting input is recorded, the computer program causing a computer to execute processing of:

producing a computer image that prompts a player to virtually touch a predetermined plurality of touch points in a predetermined order (producing nested menu shown in fig. 7, for example, in order to select process 24 a user has to touch in following order: MENU -> SELECT2 -> PROCESS24);

accepting an input of a video image of the player (using image input device 101 of fig. 3) picked up by image pickup means (camera 1 of fig. 1);

analyzing the video image (using difference value detector 107 of fig. 3) while superimposing the video image and the computer image on one another (using superimposing image generator 106 of fig. 3) and causing a display device to display a superimposed image (using display controller 108 of fig. 3), and sequentially detecting virtual touches to any of the plurality of touch points (sequentially touching nested menu shown in fig. 7, [0070]); and

accepting the virtual touches as predetermined input when the predetermined number of touch points are touched in the predetermined order by the virtual touches (as shown in fig. 7, the user has to go through nested menu by pressing at least three touch point in order for a process to execute, [0070 – 0071]).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of

Art Unit: 2629

the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

9. **Claim 2** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohba in view of Lee et al. (US 6,160,899).

As to **claim 2** (dependent on 1), Ohba discloses the information processing system, wherein the detecting means detects the virtual touch when an object within the video image overlaps any one of the plurality of touch points within the computer image [0070 – 0071].

Ohba fails to disclose that virtual touch is detected when an object having a specific color and worn by the player.

In the same field of endeavor, Lee discloses detecting virtual touch when an object is worn by the player (ring of fig. 4A, col. 4, and lines 3 – 8).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate an object worn by the player in to the system of Ohba, so as to avoid erroneous recognition (Lee, col. 3, lines 63 – 67)

Ohba in view of Lee do not disclose the object worn by the player having a specific color. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to associate a specific color with the ring object of Ohba in view of Lee, since Lee discloses that the system can also detect the color, such as flesh color (Lee, col. 3, lines 23 – 33).

10. **Claims 4, 5 and 9 – 14** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohba in view of Nakamura et al. (US 7,331,856).

As to **claim 4** (dependent on 1), Ohba discloses the information processing system, wherein:

the image producing means (image processor 2 of fig. 2) sequentially produces predetermined computer images (nested menu of fig. 7, for example, in order to select process 24 a user has to touch in following order: MENU -> SELECT2 -> PROCESS24); and

the means for executing predetermined processing (CPU 10 of fig. 2) executes the predetermined processing when the detecting means detects that the virtual touches have been made [0070 – 0071] for the respective computer images including the predetermined navigation information that is sequentially produced (nested menu of fig. 7).

Ohba fails to disclose an image each indicating two predetermined touch points to be touched next and detecting virtual touches have been made simultaneously on the predetermined two touch points.

In the same field of endeavor, Nakamura discloses an image each indicating two predetermined touch points to be touched next (as shown in fig. 9B) and detecting virtual touches have been made simultaneously on the predetermined two touch points (col. 11, line 55 – col. 12, line 6).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the device of Ohba to include features disclosed by Nakamura, so as to provide an interactive experience to a plurality of uses of the system.

As to **claim 5** (dependent on 1), Ohba discloses the information processing system, wherein: the image producing means (image processor 2 of fig. 2) produces the predetermined computer image including predetermined navigation information (nested menu of fig. 7, for example, in order to select process 24 a user has to touch in following order: MENU -> SELECT2 -> PROCESS24);

and the means for executing predetermined processing (CPU 10 of fig. 2) executes the predetermined processing when the detecting means detects that the virtual touches have been made according to the predetermined navigation [0070 – 0071].

Ohba fails to disclose predetermined navigation information indicating a predetermined order of touches to be made to the touch points.

In the same field of endeavor, Nakamura discloses predetermined navigation information indicating a predetermined order of touches to be made to the touch points (col. 30, lines 50 – 56).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the device of Ohba to include features disclosed by Nakamura, so as to provide an interactive experience to a user of the system.

As to **claim 9**, Ohba discloses an information processing system, comprising;

means for producing a computer image that prompts a player to virtually touch a predetermined plurality of touch points in a predetermined order (image processor 2 of fig. 2, producing hierarchal menu of fig. 7, wherein, for example, to run process 24 a user has to touch in following order: MENU -> SELECT2 -> PROCESS24);

means for accepting an input of a video image of the player (image input device 101 of fig. 3) picked up by image pickup means (camera 1 of fig. 1);

display control means for superimposing the video image and the computer image on one another and causing a display device to display a superimposed image (superimposing image generator 106 of fig. 3);

means for analyzing the video image during display of the computer image and detecting virtual touches to any of the plurality of touch points (difference value detector 107 of fig. 3); and

the detecting means detects the virtual touches that are made sequentially to a predetermined number of touch points in a predetermined order (as shown in fig. 7, the user has to go through nested menu by pressing at least three touch point in order for a process to execute, [0070 – 0071]).

Ohba fails to disclose object displaying means for displaying an object that connects the touch points sequentially subjected to the virtual touches.

In the same field of endeavor, Nakamura discloses an object displaying means (operation device 80, col. 35, lines 32 – 43) for displaying an object that connects the touch points sequentially subjected to the virtual touches (a large arrow which connects points to be touched, col. 35, lines 32 – 43).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the device of Ohba to include features disclosed by Nakamura, so as to provide an interactive experience to a user of the system.

As to **claim 10** (dependent on 9), Ohba discloses the information processing system, wherein a virtual touch is made to any one of the touch points (menu points of fig. 7), but fails to disclose that the object displaying means displays the object that connects any one of the touch points to another touch point previously subjected to the virtual touch.

In the same field of endeavor, Nakamura discloses that the object displaying means (operation device 80) displays the object that connects any one of the touch points to another touch point subjected to the virtual touch (a large arrow which connects points, col. 35, lines 32 – 43).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the device of Ohba to include features disclosed by Nakamura, so as to provide an interactive experience to a user of the system.

Ohba in view of Nakamura fails to disclose another point is previously subjected to a virtual touch; however, it would have been an obvious design choice alternative to connect the touch points in any order and would require an artisan only a routine skill in the art.

As to **claim 11** (dependent on 9), Ohba discloses the information processing system, wherein the virtual touches are made to the predetermined number of touch points in the predetermined order [0070 – 0071], but fails to disclose the object displaying means displays the object that connects the touch points sequentially subjected to the virtual touches.

In the same field of endeavor, Nakamura discloses an object displaying means (operation device 80, col. 35, lines 32 – 43) for displaying an object that connects the touch points sequentially subjected to the virtual touches (a large arrow which connects points to be touched, col. 35, lines 32 – 43).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the device of Ohba to include features disclosed by Nakamura, so as to provide an interactive experience to a user of the system.

As to **claim 12** (dependent on 9), Ohba discloses the information processing system, but fails to disclose that the object that connects the touch points comprises a line imitating light.

In the same field of endeavor, Nakamura discloses that the object that connects the touch points comprises a line imitating light (an arrow on display inherently emits light, col. 35, lines 30 – 43).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the device of Ohba to include features disclosed by Nakamura, so as to provide an interactive experience to a user of the system.

As to **claim 13**, Ohba discloses a recording medium (28 of fig. 2) on which a computer program for accepting an input is recorded, the computer program causing a computer to function as:

means for producing a computer image that shows a player a predetermined plurality of touch points to be virtually touched in a predetermined order (image processor 2 of fig. 2, producing hierarchal menu of fig. 7, wherein, for example, to run process 24 a user has to touch in following order: MENU -> SELECT2 -> PROCESS24);

means for accepting input of a video image of the player (image input device 101 of fig. 3) picked up by image pickup means (camera 1 of fig. 1);

display control means for superimposing the video image and the computer image on one another and causing a display device to display a superimposed image (superimposing image generator 106 of fig. 3);

means for analyzing the video image during display of the computer image and detecting virtual touches to any of the plurality of touch points (difference value detector 107 of fig. 3); and

the detecting means detects the virtual touches that are made sequentially to a predetermined number of touch points in a predetermined order (as shown in fig. 7, the user has to go through nested menu by pressing at least three touch point in order for a process to execute, [0070 – 0071]).

Ohba fails to disclose object displaying means for displaying an object that connects the touch points sequentially subjected to the virtual touches.

In the same field of endeavor, Nakamura discloses an object displaying means (operation device 80, col. 35, lines 32 – 43) for displaying an object that connects the touch points sequentially subjected to the virtual touches (a large arrow which connects points to be touched, col. 35, lines 32 – 43).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the computer program of Ohba to cause the computer to

Art Unit: 2629

function according to features disclosed by Nakamura, so as to provide an interactive experience to a user of the system.

As to **claim 14**, Ohba discloses an input interface controlling method for an information processor having a computer image producing part, an image input part, a superimposed image producing part, and a determining part, the method comprising the steps of:

producing, by the computer image producing part, a computer image that shows a player a predetermined plurality of touch points to be virtually touched (nested menu of fig. 7) in a predetermined order (image processor 2 of fig. 2, producing hierarchal menu of fig. 7, wherein, for example, to run process 24 a user has to touch in following order: MENU -> SELECT2 -> PROCESS24);

accepting, by the image input part (image input device 101 of fig. 3), an input of a video image of the player picked up by image pickup means (camera 1 of fig. 1);

superimposing, by the superimposed image producing part (superimposing image generator 107 of fig. 3), the video image and the computer image on one another and causing a display device to display a superimposed image (using display controller 108 of fig. 3):

analyzing, by the determining part, the video image during display of the computer image (using difference value detector 107 of fig. 3) and detecting virtual touches to any of the plurality of touch points [0070 – 0071].

Ohba fails to disclose displaying, by the computer image producing part, when the virtual touches are detected to have been made sequentially on a plurality of touch points, an object that connects the touch points sequentially subjected to the virtual touches.

In the same field of endeavor, Nakamura discloses displaying, by the computer image producing part (operation device 80, col. 36, line 40), when the virtual touches are detected to have been made sequentially on a plurality of touch points, an object that connects the touch points sequentially subjected to the virtual touches (trace of indicated positions, col. 36, lines 30 – 40).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the device of Ohba to include features disclosed by Nakamura, so as to provide an interactive experience to a user of the system.

Response to Arguments

11. Applicant's arguments filed 03/23/2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

12. As to applicant's argument that hierarchal menu disclosed by Ohba is not a *"predetermined" order of plurality of touch points*, the examiner respectfully disagrees. As shown in fig. 7 of Ohba, the hierarchal menu used to select a particular process involves activation of plurality of touch points (for example, in order to select process 24

Art Unit: 2629

a user has to touch in following order: MENU -> SELECT2 -> PROCESS24), and in order to invoke said process the points must be touch in a predetermined order.

13. As to applicant's argument that in the present claimed invention the entire set of touch points that must be touched by the user are all preset which differs from hierarchal menu, the examiner respectfully disagrees. As shown in fig. 7 of Ohba, in order to invoke a particular process the user must touch preset touch points (for example, in order to select process 24 a user has to touch in following order: MENU -> SELECT2 -> PROCESS24), which is identical to claimed invention.

14. As to applicant's argument that Nakamura fails to disclose highlighting visually one display area from amongst other display areas, the examiner respectfully disagrees. Ohba discloses this limitation and not Nakamura, Ohba discloses that one of the SELECT images is highlighted when selected, [0070].

15. As to applicant's argument with respect to claims 9 -14 that the examiner relies on Nakamura specifically referring to col. 25, line 55 – col. 26, line 3, the examiner respectfully disagrees. When rejecting claims 9 - 14, the examiner did to rely on section col. 25, line 55 – col. 26, line 3 of Nakamura.

16. As to applicant's argument that Nakamura fails to disclose an image indicating two touch points to be touched next and detecting virtual touches that have been made simultaneously at two touch points, the examiner respectfully disagrees. Nakamura discloses in fig. 9B a game where 2 touch points have to be touch in order to successfully pass the game (col. 11, line 55 – col. 12, line 6).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dmitriy Bolotin whose telephone number is (571)270-5873. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:00 AM - 5:00 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Amare Mengistu can be reached on (571)272-7674. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/D. B./
Examiner, Art Unit 2629

/Amare Mengistu/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2629